



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,787	12/26/2001	Robert H. China	679.0038USU	7192

7590 10/03/2003

Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggerio & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/032,787

Applicant(s)
China et al

Examiner
R.S. Travers J.D., Ph.D.

Art Unit
1617



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 26-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

The election filed July 18, 2003 has been received and entered into the file.

Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-25 in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Applicants did not approve of the restriction. This is not found persuasive because to successfully traverse a restriction, substantive reasons relating to the actual claimed subject matter must be set forth.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 26-28 reading no on-elected subject matter are withdrawn from consideration.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-12, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Information describing the JISA hardness index are not set forth in the specification in a manner enabling the skilled artisan practice the invention as claimed. Examiner notes information essential to practicing the claimed invention can be incorporated only by

Art Unit:

reference to issued United States Patents. Essential material incorporated by reference to non-United States Patents fails to meet those criteria established under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshimasa et al.

Applicants' attention is directed to *Yoshimasa et al* (see paragraphs 4-24, *specification*) teaching those ingredients herein claimed as old, well known and useful concomitantly for the utility herein envisioned, and claimed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude

Art Unit:

patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dobkowski et al and Anderson, in view of Yoshimasa et al.

Dobkowski et al (672) and Anderson (064) teach the claimed silicone elastomer (see (672) column 2,(064) Column 4), colorant ((064) column 6, paragraph 38))and nylon fillers (see (064), paragraph 27) as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These ingredients are taught as useful for formulating cosmetic formulations and various skin coverings, Claims 1-25, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments, and
- 2) specific hardness of the formulations.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two, or more, compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional cosmetic agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Art Unit:

Claims-12, 19 and 21 specifically require a composition of matter possessing a defined hardness. Yoshimasa et al employs those compounds herein recited for the cosmetic use herein claimed, at a hardness encompassed by the instant claims. Absent specific compression steps, not recited in the instant composition claims, the skilled artisan would expect on normal compression, the prior art compounds to provide the hardness herein recited, absent information to the contrary. A compound's properties are integral to those compounds. Thus, the skilled artisan would employ the prior art compounds in a cosmetic composition, and enjoy a reasonable expectation of success in formulating a composition possessing those properties herein recited, absent information to the contrary. The skilled artisan would have seen conventional cosmetic compositions, and the manufacture of these compositions by conventional means as residing in the skilled artisan purview.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.



Russell Travers J.D., Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617